

**STATUS REPORT TO THE INDEPENDENT MONITOR SUBMITTED BY THE
PARTIES TO THE COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT**

The Parties to the Collaborative Agreement, the Plaintiff Class, represented by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Ohio; the City of Cincinnati (CPD) and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) (collectively referred to as “the Parties” or “the Collaborative Partners”) submit this status report to the Independent Monitor, pursuant to Collaborative Agreement, paragraph 105.

July 5, 2006

Reporting Period: February 6, 2006 – May 5, 2006

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
A. Community Problem Oriented Policing (Paragraph 29)	3
B. Mutual Accountability Evaluation	35
C. Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement	37
D. Fair, Equitable and Courteous Treatment	38
E. Citizen Complaint Authority	41
Appendix	43

INTRODUCTION

This Report is intended to advise the Independent Monitor as to the progress that the Parties have made during the reporting period of February 6, 2006 through May 5, 2006. The Independent Monitor oversees implementation of both the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the City and the United States Department of Justice, and the Collaborative Agreement (CA) between the City, the ACLU, and the FOP. The MOA is appended to the CA and is enforceable solely through the mechanism of paragraph 113 of the Collaborative Agreement

The purpose of the Collaborative Agreement is to resolve conflict, to improve community-police relations, to reduce crime and disorder, to fully resolve the pending claims of all individuals and organizations named in the underlying litigation, to implement the consensus goals identified by the community through the collaborative process, and to foster an atmosphere throughout the community of mutual respect and trust among community members, including the police. The Parties recognize that there has been friction between some members of both the community and the CPD. The ultimate goal of the Agreement is to reduce that friction and foster a safer community where mutual trust and respect are enhanced among citizens and police.

The continued effort of police officers interacting with the community through CPOP has increased the level of trust between residents and the police. That trust has grown since the Department rolled out a reorganization of neighborhood officers to include every member of the CPD. Implementation has not only reformed police practice, but has enhanced trust, communication, and cooperation between police and the community. The City of Cincinnati continues to be enthusiastic and committed to this endeavor.

This report provides updates based on the following established committees to fully address each area stipulated in the Agreement:

- Community Problem-Oriented Policing Committee
- Mutual Accountability
- Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement
- Fair, Equitable, and Courteous Treatment
- Citizen Complaint Authority Committee

A. COMMUNITY PROBLEM ORIENTED POLICING (PARAGRAPH 29)

Item 29(a). The City, in consultation with the other Parties, shall develop and implement a plan to coordinate City departments with the CPOP focus of the CPD.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

This quarter (between November 6, 2005 and February 5, 2006) saw many changes, including: (1) restructuring of CPOP, potentially widening its berth in the CPD; and (2) raising the importance of code compliance, elevating authority over it into a legal position within the City Manager's Office, at the same time relaxing of department "silos" so that certain neighborhood issues can be addressed by a number of City departments, not just one department.

As we noted in prior Reports, the Monitor's assessment of compliance requires documentation of the City's implementation of its coordination plan, which it appears will be changing. The documentation can include relevant information, such as the number of agencies involved, the range of City services provided, the number of projects with interagency cooperation, and whether the intervention assisted in reducing the problem.

Based on a review of the CA Status Report, the Monitor finds that the City is in partial compliance.

Status Update

In response to the Monitor's request for documentation of interagency collaboration, the Parties recognize the importance of tracking the activities of CERT actions. The Action Plan is being utilized and is underway. The CPD has worked in conjunction with several other departments including the Fire Department, the Buildings and Inspections Department, and the Health Department. Unfortunately, the mechanism anticipated to house the efforts, the CPOP website, is only accessible by the police. Therefore, the efforts of other city departments are not documented as part of the problem-solving process. The Parties continue to work with CAGIS to address this disconnect and further progress.

Mr. Terry Cosgrove facilitates bi-monthly meetings with a representative from each city department, a representative from each district, and a representative from the CPD's Central Vice Control Section. These meetings have proven to keep all interested parties abreast of current and future CERT and NQOL activities.

See Appendix Item #1 to view the memo, "Code Enforcement Response Team", dated April 20, 2006 and Appendix Item #2 to view a copy of the Neighborhood Quality of Life Code PowerPoint presentation by Mr. Terry Cosgrove.

Item 29(b), the Parties shall develop and implement a system for regularly researching and making available to the public a comprehensive library of best practices in community problem-oriented policing.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Again, the Monitor compliments the Parties for their collaboration on a comprehensive library. The CPOP library may be the most comprehensive web library on a police department website. With the work of the Parties and these publications available in hard copy through the Hamilton County Library, the Monitor finds the Parties in compliance with CA 29(b). The Parties have been in compliance with this section for seven consecutive quarters. We do, however, again recommend that the CPD post the best practices library on the Department's main website. While the CPOP website is accessible to all officers, we believe the best practices library will be used more frequently by officers if it is posted directly on the CPD's main website.

As we have noted in prior reports, section 29(b) is also related to sections 29(c) and (d). We believe that compliance for 29(c) and (d), which we discuss below, will require training within the CPD of some of the 29(b) best practices, as well as their use in crime reduction efforts. Therefore, the best practices are available to CPD officers within the CPOP context.

Status Update

In response to the Monitor's recommendation to post the best practices library to the Department's main website; a link at the police department's website (under "Links" on the left hand side of the screen) is currently available to take the user to CPOP and thus to the library.

In an effort to identify successful community initiatives to improve safety and community/police relations, the CPPC has included the following publications of "best practices" for inclusion in the CPOP library:

- Video Surveillance of Public Places, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (<http://www.popcenter.org/Responses/PDFs/VideoSurveillance.pdf>)
- Tackling Crime and Other Public Safety Problems, Parts I through V, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services
 - <http://www.popcenter.org/Library/RecommendedReadings/1Tackling.pdf>
 - <http://www.popcenter.org/Library/RecommendedReadings/2Tackling.pdf>
 - <http://www.popcenter.org/Library/RecommendedReadings/3Tackling.pdf>
 - <http://www.popcenter.org/Library/RecommendedReadings/4Tackling.pdf>
 - <http://www.popcenter.org/Library/RecommendedReadings/5Tackling.pdf>
- "Glitter Track": The Use of a Temporary Restraining Order to Solve the Prostitution Problem ([http://www.popcenter.org/Library/Goldstein/1994/94-16\(F\).pdf](http://www.popcenter.org/Library/Goldstein/1994/94-16(F).pdf))

Item 29(c). The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop a “continuous learning” process through the CPD. Experiences with problem solving efforts in the field will be documented and disseminated throughout the police department and made available to the public. Problem solving will continue to be emphasized in (included but not limited to) academy training, in-service training, and field officer training.

Monitor’s Previous Assessment

The Monitor applauds the training efforts made in late 2005, and January and February of 2006. It shows an increased commitment to training around CPOP. We believe that the trainings undertaken over the last four quarters are the first steps in introducing Department employees (sworn and civilian) to CPOP. We are also heartened to see the adoption of the FOP suggestion for a short video about CPOP; this also ensures consistent information about CPOP.

Now that the CPOP role is expanding in the Department, we believe a number of additional trainings will need to occur. Pertaining to the expanded role Patrol will play in CPOP; additional training for officers is needed. Some of that training will occur informally by former COP officers; however, some of it will require a consistency of message and approach and will need to be curriculum-based. The training should prepare officers to dig into problems; it will require some training on documentation, how to manage calls, community meetings, longer term problem-solving efforts, and the use of analysis. And, as we mentioned in earlier reports, expectations for involvement should be clear and ultimately supported by the performance appraisal system.

As we noted in earlier reports, we recognize that training the entire Department is time-consuming, given the Department’s size, so planning for it is key. Folding the COP units into Patrol presents the CPD leadership with a new opportunity to impart its message. As well, with the CPD’s leadership requiring problem-solving reports from all Unit Commanders, it becomes important for those in those Units to have the training that gives them the skills to do some problem-solving or, at the very least, more sophisticated analysis.

The Department may want to develop highly focused training for supervisors about guiding, coaching, and training officers in problem solving. Perhaps surprising, an important aspect to the training will be the sergeants’ role in officer time-management. The sergeant, rather than the 911 dispatcher, will help manage calls, making sure that officers have time to problem solve and that officers spend their proactive time wisely, not just on car stops or routine patrol. Sergeants will play a key role in ensuring or inhibiting the successful transition of problem solving responsibilities from specialized units to patrol officers.

Additional training for crime analysts in how to do longer term analysis (rather than just tactical analysis) will also be critical. Both tactical and strategic analysis is involved in problem solving. Longer term analysis reveals deeper, more robust patterns and intervention points that are more likely to have long term impact. The training material

on crime analysis and the new tracking system provided to lieutenants and above suggested that tactical analysis is the primary approach of crime analysis. But given the CA emphasis on problem solving, it is important also to focus on strategic and longer term analysis. Regarding the continuous training aspect of this subsection of 29(c), the CPD is in partial compliance.

With respect to documenting and disseminating problem solving experiences in the field throughout the CPD, we see improvements this quarter as well. We stated in our October 2005 Monitor Report that the roll call bulletin is an excellent start, but it is not sufficient by itself to meet compliance. We stated our view that the CPD must quickly pick up the pace of documenting and disseminating problem solving experiences. While last quarter and this quarter there were no additional roll call bulletins involving problem solving, there was greater use of problem solving examples in other training. A good addition was Lt. Powell's sharing of examples of problem solving efforts from within the CPD and from other agencies (gleaned from agencies presenting at last year's International Problem-Oriented Policing Conference) in the updated FTO training. In addition, in the January 17th Staff Notes, the CPD leadership noted:

Training for Captains and Lieutenants on Problem-Solving and CPOP Tracking and Analysis has been completed. As the Department continues to utilize problem solving as its principal strategy, it is recommended that additional personnel attend the training as well.

This shows that the CPD is encouraging people to attend training in CPOP and the CPOP tracking system. The CPD's development of a video on CPOP is also helpful. We encourage disseminating more written examples of problem solving so Department members gain an understanding of what is expected, whether they are investigators, sergeants, officers, lieutenants or crime analysts. As we noted last quarter, we hope that by the end of next quarter, the CPD will disseminate several problem-solving write-ups. The CPD is in partial compliance on this subsection.

As for public accessibility of problem-solving efforts, the CPD's problem-solving descriptions remain accessible to the public via the internet on the CPOP website. The CPD is in compliance with the public dissemination requirement of this subsection.

Concerning the emphasis on problem solving throughout the CPD, additional training has occurred and we hope to see a ramping up of the inclusion of CPOP in many more of the training sessions the CPD presents. The CA requires that problem solving be emphasized in Academy training, in-service training and field officer training, as well as other training. Comprehensive training that shifts problem solving from a special unit responsibility to Department-wide responsibility will put the CPD in compliance. Increased access to data has allowed the Department to make a shift toward Department-

wide problem solving. We believe the training for lieutenants and above is the first step, and places the CPD in partial compliance with this subsection.¹

In earlier Reports, we noted that 29(b), (c), and (d) are linked. These and other CA sections are meant as ways to facilitate the adoption of problem solving as the CPD's principal strategy to reduce crime and disorder in Cincinnati. We have found the Parties in compliance with the public dissemination requirements under 29(b) and (c). However, because problem solving is to be adopted as the "principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems," the portions of 29(c) and (d) that deal with training and dissemination within the Department require greater efforts, as they are meant as a way to effectuate significant change in the organization. The Parties are in partial compliance with the three other subparts of this CA provision (continuous learning, dissemination within the CPD, and emphasis on problem solving in training). The Parties are in partial compliance with this section of the CA, but we are very encouraged by the accelerated pace of training during the last eight months.

Status Update

Documentation and dissemination of problem solving efforts in the field:

- Officers continue to utilize and enter problem solving activities into the CPOP website also available to the public.
- March 19, 2006 – Lt. Powell of the COP unit met with a police sergeant from the Lexington Division of Police to share information regarding Cincinnati's neighborhood officer program. The discussion centered around CPOP whereas Lt. Powell was able to provide Sgt. Chris Young with copies of our annual CPOP report as well as other documentation. Sgt. Young was very impressed with CPD's program and anticipates designing a similar program for the Lexington Police Department.

Problem solving training:

- *Academy Training*
 - The Police Academy conducted CPOP training for all sworn personnel during management and in-service training in 2004 and 2005. Non-sworn personnel received the training in 2005. Due to the recent completion of the training, there are no plans to develop a video at this time. See Appendix Item #18 to view the PowerPoint presentation, which may serve as the vehicle to address the consistency in training issue raised by the FOP.

¹ Further roll call training should supplement, but not supplant more intensive training that covers the fundamentals of problem solving and the role each person in the organization has in it, and the types of accountability that will support the system.

- In March 2006, thirty-one officers attended CPOP Liaison training to better familiarize themselves with their expanding role following the Department wide CPOP implementation.

Additionally, thirteen officers attended CPOP/SARA Computer training and Introduction to GEN7 training.

- *In-service Training*
 - March 10, 2006, March 17, 2006, March 21, 2006, and May 5, 2006: Geographic Information System and SARA review to all CPOP liaison supervisors and officers in each district on all shifts.
 - April 10, 2006: A presentation provided to new City employees of an overview of CPOP.
- *FTO Training*
 - February 28, 2006: A CPOP update was provided to FTO training candidates by the Community Oriented Policing Unit. The update included information about the Department's transition to community problem oriented policing on a comprehensive basis.

Continuous learning process:

- *Crime Analyst Training*
 - The CPD Crime Analysts attended Situational Crime Prevention training in Bowling Green, Ohio from April 24 – 28, 2006. See Appendix Item # 3 to view a copy of the lesson plan and copies of the training certificates.
- *Training specific to supervisors*
 - In April 2006, New Supervisor's Training included classes on Supervisor Problem Solving and CPOP.
- *Roll Call Training*
 - Members from the CPPC attended several roll calls to conduct presentations to officers regarding the role of the Partnering Center in CPOP. And an overview of the SARA process.

See Appendix Item # 4.

See Appendix Item #5 to view the Department's Training Record for this reporting period.

Item 29 (d), The Parties shall research best practices on successful and unsuccessful methods of problem-solving used by other professionals (e.g. conflict resolution, organizational development, epidemiology, military, civil engineering and business).

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Over the last year, we have seen more information about crime populating the CPOP website. Use of it can increase the range of countermeasures used to impact crime. We also have hope that the revised CPOP tracking system further points users to crime research. We are heartened by the mention of research in some of the projects submitted, but it remains rare. Each quarter, the problem solving efforts should reflect an increase in the variety of countermeasures that research reveals as effective for different crime problems.

As we mentioned last quarter, the Ohio Service for Crime Opportunity Reduction (OSCOR), a collaborative with the University of Cincinnati, issued four reports containing its analysis of seven drug markets in four Cincinnati neighborhoods (along with possible interventions), an evaluation of a student crime prevention awareness project, and a report containing recommendations for constructing a citywide drug market reduction approach:

- Open-Air Drug Dealing in Cincinnati, Ohio: Executive Summary and Final Recommendations at www.uc.edu/OSCOR/FINAL%20RECOMMENDATIONS.pdf
- Avondale Crime Reduction Project at www.uc.edu/OSCOR/AVONDALE.pdf
- Evanston Crime Reduction Project at www.uc.edu/OSCOR/EVANSTON.pdf
- Pendleton Crime Reduction Project at www.uc.edu/OSCOR/PENDLETON.pdf
- West Price Hill Crime Reduction Project at www.uc.edu/OSCOR/W%20PRICE%20HILL.pdf
- University Student Crime Prevention Awareness Project Evaluation, www.uc.edu/OSCOR/FINAL%20REPORT%20CRIME%20PREVENTION%20AWARENESS%20PROJECT.pdf

The OSCOR-generated reports from UC are excellent research products. Five reports focus on drug markets. One of the five reports offers a citywide, comprehensive approach to drug market reduction, and the other four contain an analysis of seven separate drug markets within four Cincinnati neighborhoods. These drug market reports provide ample information to begin more strategic attacks on the markets and the CPD disseminated the reports to District Commanders, Violent Crimes Task Force, Street Corner Narcotics, the Partnering Center, and CPOP teams for follow-up. The citywide

OSCOR report lays out the “basic elements of successful approaches used in other cities:”

- long-term commitment
- measurable objectives
- comprehensive approaches
- accountability
- publicity
- on-going evaluations, and
- strategy maintenance

This framework shows that turning crime problems around requires intentional, planned, consistent efforts. The research reports contain the beginning analysis of these drug markets (specific analysis of the dealers and the buyers from arrest data was not available), along with information about the different types of interventions that have had positive effects on markets (48 different interventions are listed).

The seven drug markets studied generated over 3,000 calls for service to police in 2004. Although each of the markets is different, patterns were identified across markets concerning: types of drugs; dates/times of market operation; territorial behavior among dealers; methods of communication between market players; demographics of dealers, lookouts, and buyers; access to arterial routes; and the presence of nearby convenience stores.

These reports offer highly specific research that the City can use to reduce drug markets. In addition, the citywide report shows how a comprehensive approach to closing drug markets across Cincinnati is achievable. We hope to see increased use of research in the CPD’s efforts to counter open-air drug markets, so that tailored responses become interventions that will be more successful than strategies of sweeps and reverse stings. One of the recommendations made is that the CPD identify how many drug markets there are in Cincinnati:

- How many open-air drug markets are currently operating in Cincinnati?
- What is the precise location of each market? (Multiple sources of data should be used to identify discrete markets. Potential sources of information are calls for service, narcotic arrest information, and resident surveys. After the markets are located, the following site-specific questions should be asked to help develop responses)
- Who are the dealers/buyers and where do they live?
- What environmental features make this location attractive to dealers/buyers?

- What interventions have been or are currently being used to disrupt this drug market?
- Once identified, is there evidence to suggest that these interventions have or have not been successful?
- What other crimes that occur in this location are related to drug market activities (e.g., loitering, theft from vehicles, homicide)?

As we noted in the prior quarter's Report, the following developments would demonstrate compliance with 29(d): research is used in problem solving projects (see 29(b)); projects apply situational crime prevention if appropriate (the CA specifically mentions situational crime prevention); projects that are on POP Guide topics show awareness of the guide and its elements; research is used in crime reduction and traffic problem reduction efforts; best practice knowledge is used as a skills measure in the performance evaluations.

The Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

Status Update

The Parties have no status update related to this subsection of the CA during this reporting period. As per the Collaborative Agreement Compliance Standards, see 29(b) and 29(k) for compliance.

***Item 29(e).** The Parties, consistent with the Community Partnering Program, shall conduct CPOP training for community groups, jointly promote CPOP and implement CPOP training.*

Monitor's Previous Assessment

During November, December and January, the Partnering Center and the CPD participated in a number of very valuable trainings and presentations. In early February, the CPD announced a restructuring of its approach to CPOP. This created some uncertainty in the community about the role the CPD and its COP officers would have in community problem solving, and even some uncertainty within the CPD. While there have been "hand-off" problems between neighborhood officers and new beat officers, and there has been some confusion about the continuation of joint presentations of CPOP by the Partnering Center and the CPD, the CPD is committed to expanding problem solving responsibilities within the CPD beyond COP officers to more people in the Department. The CPD has agreed to monitor the progress and effectiveness of its transition to Department-wide CPOP, and as a result, we expect to see greater participation in community problem solving initiatives in the upcoming months and the quarters ahead.

The Parties are in compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

A training session and overview for all newly appointed CPOP liaison officers was provided as a joint effort between the CPD's COP unit and the CPPC on March 22, 2006. See Appendix Item # 6 to view the agenda from that meeting.

The first annual CPOP Summit was held on April 8, 2006. In the spirit of collaboration, CPPC and CPD were involved in planning the event and participating in workshops/activities at the Summit. The Summit provided an opportunity to orchestrate in-depth topic specific training sessions for community members in group settings. In addition, the Summit allowed for community stakeholders to share their experiences with other community leaders in a dialogue format.

During this reporting period, the CPPC coordinated or conducted fifteen trainings. Details of the trainings are outlined below:

February 15, 2006 – A Personal Safety Training for residents of the St. Francis Court Apartments was held in South Fairmount. The goal of the training was to share information about crime in South Fairmount and educate participants about what they can do to keep themselves safe and prevent crime in their neighborhood and building. The training also provided information about observation skills, how to report suspicious activity and target hardening for the home.

February 21, 2006 – “Citizens Response to Prostitution” training was held for nineteen Over-the-Rhine residents and other stakeholders as part of a monthly OTR Chamber of Commerce Safety Sector meeting. Participants of the training included District One's Captain, Kenneth Jones and Central Vice Control Commander, Captain Howard Rahtz, as well as Kari Snyder, the Program Director for Cincinnati Union Bethels “Off the Streets” program. The goal of the program is to connect women arrested for prostitution to necessary treatment, programs and services, and educating “johns” about the risks involved with soliciting a prostitute – legal and otherwise.

March 4, 2006 – The CPPC partnered with District Five, Clifton Heights Urban Redevelopment Corporation, the Friars Club, Hughes Community Learning Center, and the University of Cincinnati to present “Neighborhood Connections.” The core elements of the program include involving residents in taking action to improve the quality of life in the neighborhood, to facilitate a better understanding of differing perspectives and concerns, and to build relationships that will lead to positive community action.

March 8, 2006 – “Introduction to Crime Prevention through Environmental Design” training was held for ten participants in College Hill. The training was co-facilitated by community member, Jim Bodmer, and held at the College Hill Recreation Center. This introductory training shared information and materials from the October and November 2005 CPTED training that was conducted for the CPPC, the CPD, and Cincinnati

residents by Greg Saville and Anna Brassard of Alternation. Participants were taught about first generation CPTED principles of territoriality, natural surveillance, access control, and image. This training also included hand out information related to Situational Crime Prevention tactics.

March 15, 2006 – The CPPC partnered with District Three for a SARA training that included five residents at the Westwood Town Hall. This core group has since added additional members through outreach and has begun the process of Scanning throughout Westwood. The training has encouraged a community-driven process that could result in the first CPPC/CPD jointly facilitated CPOP problem solving effort in Westwood.

March 18, 2006 – The CPPC coordinated with the Cincinnati Chapter of the American Red Cross to present Disaster Preparedness training for twelve College Hill residents at the College Hill Recreation Center.

March 23, 2006 – The CPPC and District Five partnered to present SARA training to five residents in Northside. These residents have since linked up with the existing CPOP team to participate in the current problem solving efforts on Fergus, Witler, and Hanfield streets.

March 29, 2006 – The CPPC facilitated a presentation at the Evanston-Norwood-Xavier Leadership Academy for twelve participants. The purpose was to communicate the need for community involvement and citizen leadership in order to maintain and establish safe neighborhoods as well as introduce participants to the CPPC, CPOP, and the SARA model.

Evaluation forms were handed out and examples of comments made are below:

“CPPC is such a valuable idea / organization. Brainstorming creative solutions to problems is key.”

“Great presentation. Very useful information for our community involvement.”

April 4 & April 11, 2006 – Two SARA trainings were presented to a total of eighteen Cincinnati Human Relations Commissions monitors. These trainings were conducted at the request of CHRC Interim Executive Director Lesley Jones to prepare participants to be active Monitors this year.

April 11, 2006 – The CPPC and CPD’s District Three partnered to present training in Riverside.

April 12, 2006 – The CPPC provided training to the current Police Recruit class regarding the role of the community in safety problem solving efforts as well as the specific role of the CPPC in supporting communities in CPOP initiatives.

Additional highlights:

A highlight of the first quarter was having the Metropolitan Area Religious Coalition of Cincinnati (MARCC) hold their annual meeting at the CPPC on February 14, 2006. Ninety representatives of MARCC's sixteen Cincinnati religious Judicatories were provided an overview of the CPPC, CPOP, and the SARA process. They were also given a list of the "Top Ten Ways MARCC Congregations Can Support CPOP." Focal points of the evening were break out sessions facilitated by CPPC staff members and featured an actual CPOP problem solving effort. The group was given the problem statement and information about the analysis by the CPOP team. They were then charged with brainstorming a list of creative and diverse response strategies that they thought were or could have been implemented to alleviate the problem. This exercise helped these representatives "practice" the SARA process and see how different their responses can be.

Item 29(f). The Parties shall coordinate efforts through the Community Partnership Program to establish an ongoing community dialogue and interaction including youth, property owners, businesses, tenants, community and faith-based organizations, motorists, low-income residents and other City residents on the purposes and practices of CPOP.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

A wide range of activities that involve and promote CPOP and show the beginnings of ongoing dialogue with different segments of Cincinnati, as required by the CA, occurred this quarter. Some were the result of the CPD's redeployment of neighborhood COP officers. Breaking down the community interactions along the lines of the groups identified by this subsection of the CA, we note that the CPD and the Partnering Center have engaged in ongoing dialogue with youth; property owners; businesses; community organizations; faith-based organizations; motorists; and other city residents. The two segments of the Cincinnati community with which there has been little reported interaction and dialogue are: tenants and low-income residents. Also, the Parties' documentation of ongoing community dialogue and structured involvement by the CPD was limited in the extent to which the FOP's and the Plaintiffs' involvement were reported. However, these two issues may be due to a lack of reporting, rather than a lack of interaction.

In prior Monitor Reports, we have stated that compliance with this CA subsection would entail a plan for structured dialogue, joint promotion of events and a review of the feedback from those events. It would also demonstrate compliance if the Parties scheduled follow-up meetings, and reported on the outcomes of the discussions and meetings, descriptions of areas of agreement and disagreement in the dialogue, and next steps.

The range and scope of the meetings and events this quarter are consistent with what 29(f) requires. This quarter shows an increase in participation by the CPD, and we would like to see even greater participation in jointly scheduled forums involving the CPD, the Plaintiffs, and the FOP. While joint forums may sometimes involve engaging citizens who are displeased with the current status quo, many citizens will walk away from these events feeling that progress is underway. Ultimately, it is to the benefit of all Cincinnatians for the Parties to proceed with these interactions, because the process of policing and the decisions that are behind police tactics and strategies are made more transparent and form the basis for dialogue and, hopefully, partnership.

We believe that if the Parties develop a plan for structured involvement with the communities identified in 29(f) and jointly promote those events, full compliance is certain. The Monitor is also open to evaluating compliance with this CA provision based on new measures agreed to by the Parties. The Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

Status Update

Community Dialogue and Interaction:

- “The Symposium on Guns and Violence in Our Communities” held May 6, 2006 featuring a panel discussion with Judge Nadine Allen, Dr. Kenneth Davis, Attorneys Brady L. Jones and Constance Potter, P.O. Gene Seay (CPD), Ms. Lynette Nealy (Mothers of Murdered Sons and Daughters), and Mr. Vinnie Smythe (100 Man March Ministries). See Appendix Item # 20 to view the flyer and an article included in *The Cincinnati Enquirer*.
- The First Annual CPOP Summit, held April 8, 2006, afforded the CPD an opportunity for the police and the CPPC staff to work together to conduct community-based training while covering a wide array of issues pertinent to the community. A panel session with representatives from the Parties discussed the history of the agreement as it relates to Cincinnati’s CPOP initiative. Breakout sessions included topics on:
 - Blighted and abandoned buildings
 - Citizen responses to street prostitution
 - Recruiting volunteers
 - Blockwatch
 - Citizens on Patrol
 - Landlords and crime prevention
 - Community safety is everyone’s business
 - Reclaiming public space (CPTED)
 - Citizens response to open air drug dealing
 - Faith-based community and problem solving

See Appendix Item # 6.

- “A Conversation on Building Neighborhoods” held on March 25, 2006 at Xavier University Cintas Center stemmed from the department-wide implementation of CPOP and the subsequent redeployment of specialized neighborhood units. Citizens came together for a creative, positive discussion designed to explain how CPOP would be utilized more comprehensively throughout the police department, and to focus on ways in which residents could build and restore their sense of safety and security in their neighborhoods through joint efforts with the CPD. This event was hosted by the Women’s City Club of Greater Cincinnati. Several officers from the CPD attended from each district.

See Appendix Item # 7.

- In February, Plaintiffs participated in the Marcus Garvey African Marketplace. This is an event that was held in Avondale. The primary purpose of this event was to allow the community to discuss economic development issues as well as issues of crime and safety.

In April, Plaintiffs participated in an anti-gang summit. This summit has been convened by Rufus Johnson of R.E.A.L. Truth, Inc. for the past 16 years. The purpose of the summit is to educate youth about issues related to gangs as well as issues of crime and safety in their neighborhoods. This summit was addressed to over 100 high school students, primarily from Woodward H.S. Plaintiffs discussed the CA and distributed literature, prepared by the ACLU, regarding what to do when stopped by the police.

Finally, also in April, plaintiffs attended several meetings convened at Mosque #5, led by Minister James Muhammad. These meetings were also attended by Councilmember Cecil Thomas. The purpose of these meetings was also to discuss the increase in violence in the city’s most troubled neighborhoods. Minister Muhammad is also a member of the Plaintiff’s Advisory Panel. Plaintiffs used each of these events to discuss the CA and how it can assist in alleviating the violent crime about which there has been so much recent media attention.

- On February 28, 2006, the CPD and the CPPC participated in a CPOP interview on WDBZ Radio to discuss the redeployment of neighborhood officers.

See Appendix Item # 8.

- Also on February 28, 2006, the CPPC Executive Director hosted a community dialogue at the request of the National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ). The dialogue was held to address the recent Human Relations Indicator Project study as they related to the community perception of fairness in their treatment by police. Attendees included Police Chief Tom Streicher, Executive Manager of Police Relations, Mr. S. Gregory Baker, CPD Public Information

Officer, Lt. Kurt Byrd and fifteen community representatives. The Monitor, Mr. Saul Green and other members of the Monitoring team also attended.

Although the discussion was difficult and challenging at times, it was important and significant. It is also clear that much additional discussion is needed to build greater understanding and appreciation of the perspectives of police and community members as it relates to trust and mutual respect.

- On May 1, 2006, Richard Biehl of the CPPC and S. Gregory Baker of the CPD participated in a panel discussion about the progress of CPOP and community/police relations. The discussion was sponsored by Better Together Cincinnati and coordinated by the Greater Cincinnati Foundation.

The discussion was one of three panel discussions scheduled to highlight Cincinnati's progress on priority initiatives identified by Cincinnati Community Action Now after the civil unrest of 2001 and the "efforts during the last five years to address race relations and racial disparities, to identify areas where more work needs to be done, and to keep the need for resolving Cincinnati's race issues in the public eye." An evaluation of the C-CAN initiatives was conducted by the Cornerstone Consulting Group and summarized in a report entitled, *Cincinnati in Black and White 2001 – 2006*. (This report can be accessed at the following website: <http://www.greatercincinnati.org>)

Ongoing dialogue with Youth

- On February 15, 2006, the COP Coordinator, Lt. Powell gave a CPOP presentation to University of Cincinnati Design Art Architectural and Planning students. And on February 28, 2006, a presentation was given to Raymond Walters Criminal Justice students.
- On March 4 and 5, 2006, the Camp Joy Spring Reunion weekend was held. Each summer, approximately eighteen officers assist the National Conference for Community and Justice in hosting a week long Police Youth Live-In, a camp that targets inner city youth. As a follow up to these annual camp outings we return to Camp Joy to assist with a Spring Camp Reunion which brings many of those youth who had attended the previous summer back to Camp Joy. Seven CPD officers participated in this spring's weekend reunion.
- April 15, 2006 – The "Stop the Violence" youth conference, sponsored by Garrison Global Academy for Legal Studies, was conducted on the University of Cincinnati's Tangeman Center. A CPD officer was invited to participate in a panel discussion promoting dialogue between adults and teenagers. Topics included law and violence, morals and ethics, date rape, and bullying.

See Appendix Item # 9.

- The CPD continues its work with the Lighthouse Youth Services program which identifies at-risk youth and provides preventive services and social interventions to discourage delinquent behavior.

See Appendix Item # 10.

***Item 29(g).** The Parties shall establish an annual award recognizing CPOP efforts of citizens, police, and other public officials.*

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The Parties have held one CPOP Awards Ceremony and are planning the second annual one. The Parties are in compliance with this CA provision.

Status Update

The Parties have begun the planning process for this year's event.

***Item 29(h).** The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop and implement a system for consistently informing the public about police policies and procedures. In addition, the City will conduct a communications audit and develop and implement a plan for improved internal and external communications.*

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD's policies and procedures remain accessible and available to the public on the CPD's website, <http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/cpd>. The City is in compliance with this part of paragraph 29(h). There is also a link in the City's CPOP website (<http://cagisperm.hamilton-co.org/cpop/>) to the CPD's procedure manual. The link provides access to community members who are engaged with the police through CPOP involvement. We believe that this sends a signal to the Cincinnati public of an increased willingness to create more transparent police operations, which is essential to building trust in the community.

Concerning the second part of this CA section, while the City conducted a communications audit and has developed a plan for improved communications (based on the scope of services developed for the community relations coordinator), this quarter paints a complicated picture of compliance. We would be remiss if we did not mention the absence of communication that accompanied the redeployment of personnel in the Department around CPOP. In fact, there still is nothing on the CPD website communicating the change. While the Monitor agrees with the CPD that Department-wide adoption of CPOP is required under the CA, and that transitioning a community from single officer to multi-officer community engagement and problem-solving can be difficult, we hope that the CPD will recognize the importance of engagement and

consultation, even when the CPD has the formal authority to make decisions and take action.

The CPD's action to redeploy personnel caught many in the community by surprise, and even many of CPD's own employees by surprise. For this reason, it was not consistent with the improved internal and external communication called for in this provision. However, a few weeks after the changes, the Monitor noted a more positive attitude within the CPD towards its CPOP and problem-solving obligations. Many members of the Department now appear energized by the fast pace of change occurring in the CPD, spurred by recent promotions formerly tied up in litigation, a new strategic planning process, use and availability of some crime analysis (victim, offender, and location information), and now the opportunity for CPD members, beyond those in COP, to participate in crime reduction projects using problem solving and community engagement. The City announced the change by saying that CPOP is "an effective, practical and operational methodology whereby community members and police work in partnership to identify problems, analyze data and information, formulate responses, and evaluate effectiveness."

The CPD is in compliance with this CA provision.

Status Update

The Internal Communications Council continues to meet monthly. See Appendix Item # 11 to review the minutes from each of the following meetings: February and April. The Police Relations Section is working in conjunction with the CPD Planning Unit and NCCJ to design and develop a community and corporate review of the Strategic Plan.

Item 29(i). The CPD will create and staff a Community Relations Unit.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The City is in compliance with this CA requirement.

Status Update

The Police Relations Unit is staffed, effective, and fully operational.

Item 29(j). The Parties shall describe the current status of problem-solving throughout the CPD via an annual report. Each party shall provide details on what it has done in relating to its role in CPOP.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The 2005 CPOP Annual Report documented the progress the Parties achieved individually and collaboratively. Those efforts were the result of significant hard work. We expect that success and inspiration to continue into 2006. The Parties are in compliance with 29(j). The Parties have been in compliance since September 2003.

Status Update

The Parties have begun to prepare for the next Annual Report for 2006 and anticipate its publication in August.

Item 29(k). The CPD Commanders shall prepare quarterly reports that detail problem-solving activities within the Districts. Reports shall identify specific problems and steps taken by the City and community toward their resolution. Reports shall identify obstacles faced and recommendations for the future. Reports should be available to the public through the Community Relations Unit.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The number of Unit Commander quarterly reports increased again this quarter. The Units reporting this quarter include: District 1 and its Downtown Services Unit; District 2; District 3; District 4; District 5; Central Vice Control Section; Street Corner Unit; Criminal Investigations Section (Homicide Unit, Personal Crimes Unit, Major Offenders Unit, Financial Crimes); Special Services Section (Traffic Unit, Youth Services Unit, Park Unit).

The Unit Commander reports are not yet part of the new CPOP tracking system. The new tracking system is loaded on relatively few computers at this point, so accessibility is limited. The reports from Unit Commanders who used the revised quarterly problem-solving reporting form (Critical Elements) showed greater detail than the other reports that used the older format or used the CPOP tracking system report format. Overall, the problem-solving reports show some improvement from earlier quarterly write-ups, and we commend the Department for the improvement.

We mentioned in earlier Monitor Reports that every project, whether SARA or CPOP, should have a start date. It is important to note the date when starting the project and at intervention points within a project, just as it is important to do so when describing events in a crime report. It will prove extremely valuable during the assessment phase when determining impact to have precision of this kind.

Overall, we noted in prior Reports that compliance with this CA provision will be demonstrated more clearly when all of the District and Unit Commanders prepare quarterly reports. The only two units not submitting reports are Planning and Crime Analysis. While the Planning Unit handles interdepartmental issues, it is also likely to analyze call load and staffing levels, which is part of the changeover to CPOP. With respect to the Crime Analysis Unit, many of its contributions will be documented in the quarterly reports of the District and Unit Commanders. However, Crime Analysis can report on the type of analysis it performs, consistent with advancing both the analysis of CPOP projects and the assessment of CPOP projects. We also noted in prior Monitor Reports that the District and Unit Commander reports should reflect an increasing use and proficiency in problem solving in their unit; a greater reliance on analysis and less reliance on unevaluated efforts; and a wide range of tactics – civil, situational crime prevention, zoning, environmental, criminal, etc. The reports also should describe the Commanders' actions and plans to involve the entire command in problem-solving and CPOP activities, rather than just the COP officers.

As noted above, some of the reports from officers are increasing in detail (a nice example is the report about 3652 Reading Road in North Avondale). We believe that crime analysts have helped by giving officers additional information about the problem. We would also like to see supervisors steering officers or investigators to problem-oriented policing guidebooks where those match the problem on which the officers are working. Sergeants should be knowledgeable about crime reduction and safety improvement countermeasures for different types of crimes and safety problems, so they in turn can coach, steer, or guide officers in effective directions. For example, the Major Offenders Unit, Special Investigations Squad would learn from one of the guidebooks the type of analysis more typically required to reduce gun violence, and an officer working on a speeding vehicles problem on a residential street would learn that traffic engineers now tend to discourage use of stop signs in this case, because people simply speed up between them to make up for lost time.

Now is the time for the CPD to ramp up the knowledge-base of officers, supervisors, and managers about crime and safety problems. In the last five years alone, there has been a substantial increase in terms of what we know about crime and countermeasures; a fair amount of that is now contained in the problem-oriented policing guides. With this knowledge, we believe that District and Unit Commanders will be well equipped in their new responsibilities.

As for the projects listed in the CPOP website tracking system, many now are labeled "resolved." We are unsure whether they are actually resolved or merely closed because of the reassignment of some of the neighborhood officers. We believe that accuracy is important, because these are records of actions in addressing chronic community crime/safety problems. We discuss this in further detail under section 29(m).

The CPD is in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

CPOP cases and problem solving activities can be reviewed at the CPOP website, www.cagis.org/cpop . Several projects and problems have been entered and updated since our last reporting period. Seventeen new cases have been entered into the system.

The following districts/units/sections submitted quarterly problem solving reports as required under this sub-section:

- District 1
- District 2
- District 3
- District 4
- District 5
- Traffic Unit
- Youth Services Unit (Does not have access to SARA/CPOP application)
- Central Vice Control Section (Does not have access to SARA/CPOP application)

The CPD has reviewed the Monitor's request to require the Planning Unit and the Crime Analysis Unit to submit quarterly problem solving reports. The Monitor states, "While the Planning Unit handles interdepartmental issues, it is also likely to analyze call load and staffing levels, which is part of the changeover to CPOP." However, our Planning Unit does not perform those functions. With respect to the Crime Analysis Unit, the CPD will continue to collect and apply analyzed data to current projects and problem solving activities without also requiring a quarterly problem solving report. The efforts of the analysts will be documented throughout other section/unit/district submissions.

***Item 29(l).** The Parties shall review existing Police Academy courses and recommend new ones in order to effectively and accurately inform police recruits, officers, and supervisors about the urban environment in which they work.*

Monitor's Previous Assessment

This quarter showed significant progress. The FOP is on the Training Committee and the Plaintiffs attended several Academy training programs, making recommendations for consideration. The Parties are in compliance with this section of the CA.

We applaud the changes proposed for the Recruit curriculum and look forward to seeing the updated training. To maintain compliance, the CPD should consider and respond to the FOP's and Plaintiffs' training recommendations.

Status Update

Response to recommendations made by the Parties to the CA

The Plaintiffs recommended the Police Academy add a component in which specific training occurs with respect to African-Americans and their communication style and urban experience. The Police Academy developed training curriculum meeting this specific need and inserted it into training for new supervisors. Mr. S. Gregory Baker, Executive Manager of Police Relations, and Mr. Kenneth Glenn, Interim Director of the Citizens' Complaint Authority, conducted the training on April 24, 2006. Mr. Baker has also met with the Training Academy to design and develop new training to address cross-cultural communications.

In addition, Lieutenant Colonel Vincent Demasi, Administrative Bureau Commander, and Lieutenant Anthony Carter, Assistant Police Academy Commander, conducted a planning meeting with representatives from the University of Cincinnati to discuss utilizing the University's expertise in this area in future training. No further meetings have been scheduled at this time.

Evidence of new training that may include steps to introduce recruits to communities, community events, community leaders, and citizens

The 100th Police Recruit class has been extended one week to allow recruits to partner with various communities on problem solving projects and to attend community meetings to understand the unique and diverse concerns of community members. Recruits partnered with Over-the-Rhine community leaders in April 2006 in a problem solving project to eliminate blight in the area.

Evidence of problem specific training

Problem solving training was conducted during the "New Supervisor's Training" on April 21, 2006. The training was conducted by the Tri-State Regional Community Policing Institute and Academy staff personnel. The course was eight hours in duration.

Item 29(m). *The Parties, in conjunction with the Monitor, shall develop and implement a problem-tracking system.*

Monitor's Previous Assessment

As we noted last quarter, improvements to the problem-tracking system are a significant advance. The Community Relations Unit and CAGIS have worked very hard to revamp the system and offer officers, the Partnering Center, CPOP members, and citizens a more advanced and easy to maneuver system.

Last quarter we noted the importance of providing mentoring and coaching to officers in the first few months of the system's operation. Mentoring will add precision to the problem solving projects and help advance the Department's knowledge base about problem locations. We also highlighted that the system, like any new information system, will only be as good as the information inputted. We believe that the CPD is committed to doing what is necessary to make the system a success. We offer our assistance if desired.

Some aspects of the system were not yet operational at the time the Monitor previewed it in late 2005 (call for service access, access to crime reports, arrest information, mug shot access, and FI information). CAGIS intends "progressive functionality." In other words, different data sets will come on-line inside the system over time. Access to calls for service, crime reports, arrest information, mug shots, and FI information is expected to come on-line within the system by the end of next quarter. Use of these new databases within the tracking system will also require training.

Last quarter, we noted that based upon a review of recent projects in the tracking system, we noticed an improved level of information among the CPOP projects entered, due to greater use of the free-form entry blocks that query officers to "provide specifics." Although some of the CPOP projects still require basic information, we are hoping that this is part of the initial difficulties from a new system and will be resolved quickly. We hope that each CPOP report will contain call for service, crime data, and other information, as well as some evidence of analysis of the information. The fruits of problem solving -- the ability to identify a longer term, more precise solution to a crime/safety problem -- are only enjoyed if analysis is done. We see the descriptions of the call for service information in the projects as very weak. We believe this can be easily corrected. Last quarter, the Monitor team sent the CRU an excerpt from one of the OSCOR reports (described in 29(d)) to show the type of sorting one can do with call for service information for a specific location.

One outstanding issue pertaining to the website is that the Partnering Center still does not have the type of access that would permit outreach workers to add information about a problem-solving case. The Partnering Center is willing to pay the licensing costs of access to CAGIS and the tracking system if they are also able to have access to the crime data in the system.

In regards to the current set of cases in the tracking system, as of April 5, 2006, the tracking system contains 86 cases. Of the 86 cases, 68 are listed as resolved. The CA Status Report from the Parties states that cases are being added to the system, 14 new ones this quarter, and some are being edited/updated. Based on the data in the system on April 5, 2006, it appears that only 11 were added since December 2005, and no case has been added in District 2 since October 20, 2004, a period of one and one half years.

Of the 86 cases, 11 are SARA projects (non-CPOP, problem solving projects). Of the 11 SARA projects, all were begun since November 2005. There have been no CPOP projects begun since that point. This may be one of the reasons for the decline in the

number of active CPOP teams. We fully recognize that there will be many projects that do not involve the Partnering Center. We also understand that the Partnering Center is providing information at CPD roll calls about how the Center and its outreach workers can help CPD officers. We encourage the CPD to further publicize the Partnering Center to its members. Staff Notes and the Blue Wave may be ideal vehicles for an article about the Partnering Center.

The success thus far of CPOP in Cincinnati rests on many shoulders, and one of them is the Partnering Center. In some Cincinnati neighborhoods the Partnering Center has been more successful than in others; this is to be expected. Overall, the Partnering Center has brought many people to the table, publicized the joint efforts of the community and the police, and provided training to the CPD and to community residents, and connected people and police with community resources. We hope to see extended use of the Partnering Center in tackling Cincinnati's crime and safety problems. It is an asset, a bridge builder, and a valuable resource to the Cincinnati community.

We stated last quarter that the system is new. Given the changes this quarter in assignment of responsibility for problem solving efforts, and the large number of projects now listed as "resolved," we are concerned about the status of the projects that are in the tracking system. We will defer judgment about compliance until we have a better understanding of how projects are being handed off and assessed for impact.

Status Update

Seventeen new cases were entered into the CPOP website during this reporting period.

Information on the CPOP website has been under discussion between the CPD and the CPPC. Many of the reports summarizing city-wide problem solving activities were outdated and redundant. The Quarterly Community Involvement Reports mirrored the Quarterly Problem Solving Reports while the CPOP Team Monthly Reports, generated by the Partnering Center, included information that should be included in their respective CPOP case. As a result, the Quarterly Problem Solving Reports remain as a link under the "Updates" section of the website to include all activities generated by each district/section/unit. Some sections/units do not yet have access to the application required for entering information thus leaving the necessity to post the reports on the website.

The CPD and the CPPC have met to discuss progress towards outreach workers entering information into the application in conjunction with police officers. While the CPPC does not have in-house access to the desktop application at their location, they have always had access to inputting information at any of the available districts. This should not be considered an "outstanding issue" by the Monitor. Outreach workers from the CPPC have had an open invitation to any of the locations housing the SARA/CPOP application. In addition, progress towards installing the SARA application at the Partnering Center is moving forward now that crime data is provided to them.

CPPC activities for March 2006 are included as Appendix Item #21.

Item 29(n). The City shall periodically review its staffing in light of its commitment under CPOP and make revisions as necessary subject to funding provisions of this Agreement.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CA requirement suggests an assessment is required of the Department's organization in light of the adoption of problem solving as the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems.

The redeployment of COP officers back into patrol, widening the responsibility for problem solving, has also allowed the CPD, through transfers of officers, an opportunity to increase staffing at Districts that had high crime and calls for service. This is an important move and consistent with the principles of this CA section. We also believe that the hiring and training of additional crime analysts is an important step in moving towards a more information-driven department. These crime analysts will need to have a full understanding of problem-oriented policing so they can provide greater assistance on projects of increasing complexity. The crime analysts should be extremely well versed in the type of analysis problem solving typically involves and the wide variety of countermeasures that can be used to stem crime. The problem-oriented policing guides on the CPOP website offer a good start to begin their education about problem solving.

As the monitoring of crime continues in the coming years, the CPD may find it requires more crime analysts to help unravel, digest, and direct police responses to crime. This may be something the CPD will want to consider while the strategic plan is in draft form.

The Monitor noted in last quarter's report that the strategic plan should support and accelerate the move towards CA compliance, so the CPD can fulfill its already defined responsibilities under the CA. These responsibilities form the basis for both impacting crime and establishing trust between Cincinnati residents and the police. The Monitor looks forward to seeing a draft of the strategic plan. We believe that the strategic plan is a good place to affirm the CPD's commitment to the CA, and that it can be used to more quickly operationalize the CA.

The move towards greater Department participation in problem solving, the redeployment of officers to higher crime areas, and the hiring of crime analysts places the CPD in compliance with this subparagraph of the CA.

Status Update

The Parties have nothing to report under this subsection.

Item 29(o). The City shall review and, where necessary, revise police departmental policies and procedures, organizational plans, job descriptions, and performance evaluation standards, consistent with its commitment to CPOP.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Performance Evaluations. The Monitor met twice within the last six months with the Planning Unit Captain who oversees the PIT team. At our last meeting, progress on performance evaluations is stalled because of concerns raised by the FOP leadership. The 2004 adopted performance evaluations will not place the CPD in compliance. We encourage further discussions with the FOP to devise a system that will put the CPD in compliance. Any new performance appraisal system should be consistent with the CA and MOA, it should support problem solving, reflect that problem solving is the principal strategy of the Department, and be a means of accountability within the Department.

Job Descriptions. As we have noted in prior reports, the CPD will also need to revise its job descriptions in light of CPOP, particularly those relating to patrol officer, police specialists, investigators, FTOs, sergeants, FTO sergeants, lieutenants, captains, and lieutenant colonels. Revising job descriptions allows a police organization the opportunity to redefine its approach and what is expected of its employees, as well as the type of skills it seeks for different positions. It even helps clarify the types of skills sought through recruitment. If problem solving is central to how the CPD will police, then it is these skills and evidence of their use (among other things) that will be reflected in selected people who should be promoted or assigned to special assignments. In addition, revised performance evaluation systems and job descriptions can help support the strategic plan, which is currently under revision and is discussed in 29(n).

Policy Revisions. CPD leadership directed specific Unit Commanders to file a quarterly problem solving report and will use the form titled *Critical Elements That Must Be Addressed in Quarterly Problem Solving Reports* to improve upon the type of information that is contained in these reports. The City has made progress this quarter by adopting the new Critical Elements form, and some of the Commanders used the form. We believe that it will be helpful if the CPD provides examples to the Unit Commanders of a thorough, complete project-write, just as examples are used when introducing other types of reports in a department.

Organizational Plans. In this section we discuss the strategic plan, followed by the redeployment of neighborhood officers. The strategic plan is now in draft form, and the Chief approved the strategic directions (goals) in the plan: Public Safety, Community Partnerships, Personnel Development, Resource Management, and Technological Advancements. The CPD expects completion of the plan soon and the final draft will be presented to a number of key community stakeholders for their review and comment. As we stated in 29(n), and in our prior Report, the strategic plan should support and accelerate the move towards CA compliance so the CPD can fulfill its (already-defined) responsibilities under the CA, which form the basis for both impacting crime and

establishing trust between Cincinnati residents and the police. We believe that the strategic plan is a good place to affirm the CPD's commitment to the CA and can be used to more quickly operationalize the CA.

The redeployment of neighborhood officers, if intended to widen the breadth of employees engaged in problem solving in the Department, can accelerate the adoption of CPOP in the Department. The CPD has stated that it will monitor the transition over the first two months to see if it is working, with the possibility of returning to the prior special unit approach or fine-tuning the new approach.

The City has made some progress this quarter by adopting the new Critical Elements form, however it is still not in full use by the Unit Commanders. Revisions to performance evaluations and job descriptions are key elements in this section, as they can help drive the type of change the CA requires. Further progress is needed in these two areas. The redeployment that resulted in a larger part of the Patrol Bureau asked to participate in CPOP is a significant step. We believe that this quarter is critical for making this new approach work and will reserve judgment until the end of next quarter when it can be assessed whether CPD has done enough to make this approach work.

The CPD is not in compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

Revision of department policies and/or procedures

On May 9, 2006, Procedure 12.370 Problem Solving Process was revised requiring the following districts/sections/units to provide a quarterly problem solving report to the Police Chief:: all five districts, the Downtown Services Unit; Central Vice Control Section's Mid-level Drug Unit; Criminal Investigations Section's Financial Crimes Unit, Homicide Unit, Major Offenders Unit, and Personal Crimes Unit; Special Services Section Park Unit, Traffic Unit, and Youth Services Unit. Additionally, the Form 562, CPOP Resource Request, was created to request department resources or funding for CPOP projects.

See Appendix Item # 13 to review the new procedure and # 14 to review the new Form 562.

Review or revision of organizational plans

On February 21 and 22, 2006, the command staff of lieutenants and above including equivalent non-sworn police department staff attended the 2006 Leadership Retreat at the Marriot Kingsgate Hotel. The two day retreat was composed of three themes: Day 1, "Creating a Sense of Urgency"; Day 2, Part I, "The Time is Now!" and Part II, "The Future is Yours."

On the second day, a draft of the department's Strategic Plan was discussed in break out sessions. On March 29, 2006, a smaller select group finalized the Strategic Plan document. The Strategic Plan contains five "Strategic Directions (Goals)":

- 1) Public Safety
- 2) Community Partnerships
- 3) Personnel Development
- 4) Resource Management
- 5) Technological Advancement

The Strategic Plan was submitted and approved by the Police Chief in mid-May 2006. Before the Strategic Plan is released and posted on the department's website, Mr. S. Gregory Baker, Executive Manager of the Police Relations Section, is facilitating a community review of the Strategic Plan for June 2006. The Planning Section is developing a reporting mechanism to track the progress of the objectives and strategies in the plan.

See Appendix Item # 15 to view the agenda for the 2006 Leadership Retreat.

Review or revision of job descriptions

Job descriptions were updated in **November 2004** requiring a strong commitment to CPOP and the use of the SARA model of problem solving in every area of police operations and specific positions. On February 12, 2006, the Police Chief directed the integration of CPOP into all police operations. This should satisfy the Monitor's requirements that the staffing review and job descriptions are updated to reflect the police department's strong commitment to CPOP.

Review/Revision of performance evaluations

In January 2006, the Police Chief reviewed a comprehensive update about the progress of the annual performance evaluation project. The Chief has asked the PIT team to continue their work. On May 11, 2006, the entire Performance Evaluation PIT team met to discuss selection of core performance anchors and assignment specific anchors for Uniform Patrol, Investigative Units, Administrative Staff, and Supervisory Personnel. This meeting was very productive.

The PIT team is recommending ten core performance anchors for all sworn employees and five core performance anchors for the four assignment specific categories listed above. In addition, Planning Section has created a *draft* revision of a new sworn performance report, Form 448.

The core performance anchors, assignment specific performance anchors, and *draft* revision of the Form 448 will be discussed with the Administrative Bureau Commander and submitted to the Police Chief for approval. Once preliminary approval is granted, the

PIT team will meet again to discuss writing the performance standards for each core category. It will be important to plan for supervisor and employee training of a revised annual performance evaluation. This project is scheduled for completion by mid-2006, training of supervisors in the third quarter of 2006, with implementation by January 2007.

Item 29(p). The City shall design a system that will permit the retrieval and linkage of certain information including repeat offenders, repeat victims, and/or locations.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The new system the CPD has selected is expected to be capable of retrieving and linking information in the CPD's current computer information systems to enable the CPD to track repeat offenders, repeat victims, and repeat locations, for use in problem solving, CPOP cases, District/Unit Commander reports, Planning and Analysis Reports, and Crime Analysis Unit reports. The system will increase the CPD's ability to identify trends and patterns and use them to undertake problem-solving efforts. While the CPD's current information systems provide some information, they are systems that are based on traditional models of policing, where incidents were documented typically as isolated or non-recurrent events, where pattern analysis might focus on an offender "m.o.," rather than also on repeat location, repeat location types, repeat victim, and repeat victimization locations. Up until now the CPD was not using its current system to this capacity.

During our site visit, we were extremely pleased that the Department is now able to provide some repeat victim and repeat offender information, which the CA has called for and we have requested.² As a result, beginning next quarter, we also expect to see projects associated with the people identified by the repeat data.³ Creation of the three databases represents a substantial improvement.

We believe if CPD makes a few changes in the databases it will be in full compliance. There is an excellent, brief publication on repeat victimization titled, Analyzing Repeat Victimization. The Monitor believes this will help ITMS modify the databases so that even more robust patterns are revealed. We bullet below two points of information and refer ITMS to this publication (free at <http://www.popcenter.org/Tools/tool-repeatVictimization.htm>) where more detailed explanations are available.

² Also available now is a problem-oriented policing guide on repeat victimization, at <http://www.popcenter.org/Tools/tool-repeatVictimization.htm>.

³ At the December 2005 All-Parties meeting, the CPD indicated that in addition to "address-specific" problem solving efforts, it is engaged in larger-scale problem solving efforts, in particular, efforts in the Over-the-Rhine neighborhood. Problem-solving does not have size limitations. We encourage the CPD to write up crime/safety problems it has identified (large or small), the substantive analysis it has completed, the range of countermeasures identified and selected based on the analysis, and the assessment measures it will be using.

- Using too short a time frame for the data diminishes the ability to identify repeat locations and repeat victims. For instance, for repeat victimization data (whether of a person or a place) even a calendar year tends to be too short a period of time.
- Upon viewing sorted data on offender, victim, and place, police organizations typically find that improvements are needed in data quality and so changes are instituted to improve accuracy in call taking, report taking, and data entry. In addition, offense reports sometimes require modification so that the detail is more easily captured improving pattern analysis.

A template tool for repeat victimization to help a police department describe the different types of repeat victimization patterns it has, can be found at [http://www.popcenter.org/Tools/Supplemental_Material/Detecting_RV_Tool\(1\).xls](http://www.popcenter.org/Tools/Supplemental_Material/Detecting_RV_Tool(1).xls).

The CPD can now begin to use the information revealed from the initial sorting of repeat data to develop problem-solving efforts around repeat victims, locations, and repeat offenders. We look forward to seeing these additional problem solving efforts. The CPD is in partial compliance with this CA provision, and it can use the information in the *Analyzing Repeat Victimization* publication to move into full compliance relatively quickly.

Status Update

Information Technology Management Section (ITMS) and Crime Analysis Unit (CAU) personnel are in the process of reviewing the information provided by the Monitor in their last quarterly report. The publication titled *Analyzing Repeat Victimization* has been forwarded to all Department crime analysts and will be discussed in detail at the next scheduled monthly analyst meeting. The publication is an excellent source of information for the Department analysts to increase their knowledge base.

The Monitor specifically mentions two areas where the Department can improve repeat victimization data:

- Currently, the Department tracks repeat calls for service by arrests, locations, and suspects for the previous quarter. The Monitor recommends a larger time frame be evaluated. CAU personnel have access to historical data back to 1997 and will evaluate a larger time frame so as not to diminish the ability to identify repeat victimization.
- First line supervisors are tasked with ensuring data accuracy in call taking, report taking, and data entry. The Department analysts are designing a recommended modulus operandi (m.o.) sheet to be completed by officers with the offense report. This m.o. sheet will allow for more detailed data to be captured improving pattern analysis. CAU personnel are evaluating

the repeat victimization template provided by the Monitor and the template will be discussed at the next monthly analyst meeting.

Evidence of crime analysts providing specific repeat address information to District Commanders:

Information submitted by District One and District Five.
See Appendix Item # 16.

Item 29(q). The City shall secure appropriate information technology so that police and City personnel can access timely, useful information to detect, analyze and respond to problems and evaluate their effectiveness.

Monitor's Previous Assessment

Last quarter the CPD reported that it expects the CAD portion of the new system to be on line between January 2007 and April 2007. For the RMS portion of the system, it is expected to be on line by June 2007 (with some modules up earlier).

Last quarter, the CPD cites its use of its current systems, and the fact that the new CPOP tracking system is now on-line, as a basis for a determination of compliance. In the Monitor's October 2005 report, we noted that we had not found sufficient evidence of analysis in the projects the CPD has submitted to find the CPD in compliance. In only a few projects is there mention of the number of calls for service at a location and the projects do not include an analysis of the calls and what they suggest about the problem. Many of the problems the CPD is looking into in the community likely have been problems for years, repeat locations that are only recently being worked in a fashion that is somewhat different from an incident-driven response.

We also said in our last Report that the "progressive functionality" of the tracking system means that the system is still mostly a tracking system and many of the other systems to which it will link are not yet linkable. We stated that paragraph 29(q) would be satisfied by an RMS/CAD system that is designed, programmed, and used to identify (detect) patterns and ease analysis and assessment of problems, whether citywide or location specific.

The Monitor has reconsidered. We believe that the work done under 29(p) also puts the CPD in partial compliance for 29(q). The repeat location, victim, and offender databases are a beginning; although improvements are still needed along the path described in 29(q). Once the new systems are up, they will need to ease access to this type of information and improve the CPD's capacity to scan, analyze, respond to and assess. The City is in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

Status Update

See response to previous subsection.

Plaintiffs' Statement re: CPOP:

CPD embarked upon a significant restructuring in February of this year. The goal of this restructuring was to broaden the awareness and capacity to do problem solving and CPOP department-wide. The stated goal was to make certain that CPOP was not just a program contained within a small section of the department. Plaintiffs support these goals and applaud the determination of CPD to broaden the reach of CPOP within the department. Unfortunately, there have been significant missteps in the implementation of this reorganization. We believe it's urgent that CPD work with the parties and the Partnering Center to correct these missteps in order to avoid substantial harm to the potential of CPOP throughout our communities.

By its own admission, the CPD did not handle the roll out of this reorganization to the communities as effectively as could have been hoped. However, since February, it seems most citizens are prepared to work with this new structure and forget the bumpy start. Plaintiffs are hearing, however, that certain difficulties with the new system are persisting and, in some cases, getting worse. The primary complaints from citizens appear to be the following: first, there seems to be a lack of continuity in the officers that are working on CPOP problems with CPOP teams. Under the reorganized structure, CPOP officers are not consistently able to make it to CPOP meetings. This has occurred in Madisonville, Price Hill, Walnut Hills, Westwood and other communities. At the May All Parties' Meeting, the Partnering Center presented a spreadsheet identifying such occurrences. That spreadsheet has been appended to this status report.

A second substantial issue that community members have involves the situation where a substitute officer shows up to a planned CPOP meeting. Under the reorganization, the officer who may have begun working with the CPOP team may be required to take service calls and, thus, be unavailable to attend a particular CPOP meeting. Under the current system, a substitute officer is sent. Often times, the replacement officer is not up to speed with respect to the problem upon which the team is working. Other times, the replacement officer does not understand the SARA process at all. This has occurred in Madisonville, Kennedy Heights, Riverside, and other communities.

To be sure, Partnering Center staff also note successes. Apparently, two officers working with the CPOP initiative in the CUF area are very accessible and helpful. Unfortunately, these successes are the exception and Plaintiffs have heard complaints similar to those above from community members themselves. Thirdly, community members have experienced similar consistency issues with respect to the CPOP cellular phone numbers that allow round the clock access to a CPOP supervisor. Because these phones are carried by different supervisors, if a citizen needs to follow up with an officer regarding an issue or a concern and another officer has the cellular phone, that officer often has no

idea about the problem the citizen is describing. This lack of reliable information transmittal from one CPOP supervisor to another is quite frustrating to citizens.

In sum, while applauding the goal of extending the reach of CPOP within the department, Plaintiffs are highly concerned about the apparent absence of a plan to make this reorganization truly successful. We believe that the success of this reorganization, and CPOP generally, requires a much greater attention to consistency. This means that even if a CPOP team works with different officers from one problem to the next, within the context of any particular CPOP initiative, officers must be given the time to follow that initiative through to its conclusion. The consistency that citizens are looking for here will probably require officers who work with CPOP teams to be freed from doing radio runs while the CPOP team is meeting and for some number of hours required to collect important information upon which the CPOP team may rely. With respect to the CPOP cellular phones, it appears that additional training is required to ensure that citizen concerns/calls/issues are communicated from one supervisor to the next until the issue is either resolved or, at least, the citizen is effectively apprised of the status of their concern. Improving the effectiveness of communications relating to CPOP between supervisors who are taking CPOP cell phone calls will relieve citizens from having to "start from the beginning" each time they call this number. It's important to note here that Plaintiffs believe this 24 hour CPOP cellular coverage is a great idea. It simply needs some tweaking to really live up to its potential. Finally, it is important that CPD create some system to audit the efficacy of what is essentially a new CPOP delivery system. While it's true that no such auditing system existed for the prior neighborhood officer structure, there is much anecdotal evidence to suggest that community residents involved in CPOP were very satisfied with that structure and quite attached to these officers. It is because of the change in the delivery system of CPOP services that some type of auditing mechanism is important. Such an audit would include surveys of CPOP team members from around the city. It would also include surveys of citizens who have called the CPOP supervisor cellular numbers. Much of this information is already being captured by the Partnering Center. CPD simply needs to review this information and create a strategy to eliminate those issues that are evident. The Parties and the Partnering Center can certainly assist in developing a meaningful mechanism to measure the success of this reorganization and, moreover, identifying methodologies to correct any significant failings. Finally, it's clear that much training in SARA and CPOP is required for those officers who were not neighborhood officers prior to the reorganization. Citizens should be able to assume that any officer sent to a CPOP meeting will be well versed in the SARA methodology. A schedule for such training should be drawn up as soon as practicable.

B. MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY EVALUATION

Evaluation Protocol

Items 30-46, Evaluation Protocol

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CA provisions call for a comprehensive approach to evaluation that is broader than efforts in most other cities. We believe that the efforts undertaken in the first year of the Evaluation Protocol and the results of RAND's research provided valuable information and lessons learned, that now need to be used to improve police-community relations and advance the goals of the Collaborative Agreement. RAND's 2006 research and its second Evaluation Report will provide additional information about the progress made by the Parties in achieving the goals of the CA. We are convinced that the results of the Year One Evaluation Report reinforce and validate the CA's approach that problem solving must be the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder in Cincinnati.

The Parties are in compliance with the CA provisions requiring the development of a system of evaluation, and a protocol for accomplishing this evaluation (CA ¶31-34). Having published the RAND report and conducted a community forum in January 2006 with a principal researcher for RAND to discuss the report, the Parties are in compliance with implementation and with the requirement of public reporting of the results of the Evaluation Protocol (CA ¶35-43). With the publication of RAND's first report, the Parties have a strong basis for assessing whether the CA goals are being accomplished, and have a benchmark to measure progress in 2006.

The CA continues to require the Parties meet with the Monitor "to study the results of the evaluation instruments and determine what changes, if any, in the Agreement or in their actions should be pursued in light of the evaluation results" (CA ¶30). Paragraph 46 of the CA also states that "measurement of the success of the mutual accountability process" will be based on whether the evaluation data was "fully and fairly used to assess progress toward attaining the goals" of the CA, and whether the data was used "to adjust City, police and community strategies to address problems, reduce police and citizen use of force and improve police/community interaction."

In the RAND Report and in our last Monitor's Report, the Monitor set out several recommendations for actions that the Parties and the Cincinnati community should take. One area that has a significant prospect for improvement in police-citizen relations is communications in traffic stop encounters. As RAND states, "[s]ubstantial improvements are possible if both police and community members make the effort [p. 108]." The Monitor also seconded RAND's call for a larger dialogue about how Black neighborhoods are policed. This would include discussions regarding incorporating problem solving and CPOP into hot spot/crime sweep efforts, and an examination of how and where arrests are being made and how they correlate to reported crime. Aggressive

traffic enforcement may engender greater distrust, and may not be effective in reducing crime or improving traffic safety.

The RAND citizen survey demonstrates the wide gap in perceptions between whites and blacks in Cincinnati that must be addressed. These gaps must be reduced in future years for the CA to be successful and its goals to be achieved. The RAND report, particularly the traffic stop and video analysis, suggests that the principal problem is not officer-bias and the attitudes of individual police officers. It is instead the impact on the black community of decisions about police strategy. The right police strategy is one that effectively reduces crime, makes people feel safer, and reduces perceptions of police unfairness and bias. As noted by RAND, police research has shown that proactive policing can create frustration and distrust of the police, and its effectiveness is questionable.⁴ This is why the CA emphasizes problem solving and problem-oriented policing. Research shows that CPOP is effective policing.

Status Update

CPD continues to work with RAND and is in receipt of the current quarterly report.

⁴ See *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The Evidence*, National Research Council of the National Academies, Wesley Skogan and Kathleen Frydl, eds., (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2004) at 228-230.

C. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Collaborative Items 47-49

Pointing Firearms Complaints

The investigations of complaints of improper pointing of firearms from March 2000 to November 2002 were forwarded to the Conciliator, Judge Michael Merz, in July 2003. The Parties also submitted supplementary materials to Judge Merz for his review in making his decision under Paragraph 48. On November 14, 2003, Judge Merz issued his decision. Judge Merz determined that there has not been a pattern of improper pointing of firearms by CPD officers. Therefore, CPD officers will not be required to complete a report when they point their weapon at a person. The Parties are in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 48.

D. FAIR, EQUITABLE AND COURTEOUS TREATMENT

Collaborative Items 50-54. The CA requires the Parties to collaborate in ensuring fair, equitable and courteous treatment for all, and the implementation of bias-free policing. Data collection and analysis are pivotal to tracking compliance, and training is essential to inculcate bias-free policing throughout the ranks of the CPD. The Monitor, in consultation with the Parties, is required to include detailed information regarding bias-free policing in all public reports. The collection and analysis of data to allow reporting on bias-free policing is to be part of an Evaluation Protocol developed with the advice of expert consultants.

51. Training and Dissemination of Information *The Parties shall cooperate in the ongoing training and dissemination of information regarding the Professional Traffic Stops Bias-Free Policing Training Program.*

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD reports efforts to learn of additional training programs on biasfree policing and to enhance its current training program. The Monitor looks forward to seeing the results of these efforts. With new training efforts and coordination with the FOP and Plaintiffs, we are hopeful that the Parties will be in full compliance with this provision. At present, the Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

Status Update

The Police Academy is currently in the planning stage of developing a bias-free policing refresher training module for all sworn members of the Department. Academy staff members are currently working with Mr. S. Gregory Baker to develop the curriculum. The training is projected to begin during the fourth quarter of 2006.

52. Professional Conduct *In providing police services the members of the CPD shall conduct themselves in a professional, courteous manner, consistent with professional standards.*

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The CPD has put policies and procedures in place in compliance with this CA provision. However, the RAND report does identify concerns with cross-racial communications between officers and drivers that could be improved by additional training.

53. Data Collection and Analysis *The Monitor, in consultation with the Parties, shall in all public reports, include detailed information including but not limited to the racial composition of those persons stopped (whether in a motor vehicle or not), detained, searched, arrested, or involved in a use of force with a member of the CPD, as well as the race of the officer stopping such persons.*

Monitor's Previous Assessment

a. Traffic Stop Data Collection

The CPD is collecting traffic stop data on Contact Cards, which are now being used by RAND for analysis. The CPD has implemented steps to address concerns raised by the RAND report regarding documentation of traffic stops, including the completion of information on the contact cards. The Monitor's audit of contact cards showed a significant improvement in contact card completion.

Status Update

The CPD continues to collect traffic stop data for the RAND Corporation.

b. Data Collection on Pedestrian Stops

The Parties are not in compliance with this requirement.

Status Update

The Parties would like to schedule a meeting with the Monitor to clarify compliance under this subsection. The Parties believed compliance was met through the collection of contact cards.

c. Use of Force Racial Data

The Parties are in compliance with this requirement.

d. Favorable Interactions

The Parties are in compliance with this requirement.

e. Unfavorable Interactions

The Parties have developed a protocol for reporting unfavorable interaction by CPD officers with citizens. The protocol has been approved and entered by the Court as "Protective Order Re:

Mutual Accountability Reports of Unfavorable Conduct by Citizens During Implementation of the Collaborative Agreement.” Mutual Accountability Forms have been developed and will be made available at all police districts and units of assignment. The Parties will be in compliance with this CA requirement when these forms are available for completion and then collected. The Parties are not in compliance with this provision.

Status Update

The boxes slated to collect this data are still in the process of being constructed.

E. CITIZEN COMPLAINT AUTHORITY

Collaborative Items 55-89

Monitor's Previous Assessment

The City is in compliance with the provisions relating to establishing the CCA and the CCA Board. However, we urge the City of Cincinnati to move forward on Board appointments to this critically necessary institution. Not only are there two vacancies to the Board, but the terms of three current Board members will expire at the end of 2006.

Paragraph 74 requires that the Chief of Police and the Executive Director develop written procedures that will assure the timely exchange of information and the efficient coordination of CCA and CPD investigations. A written protocol was finalized and approved in 2005. The protocol addresses the concerns from previous quarters that a number of complaints were received by the CPD and investigated, but not referred to the CCA until well after the complaint was filed, and in some cases not until after the CPD had completed its investigation.

Paragraph 80 requires the CCA and the CPD to develop a shared database to track all complaints, the manner in which they are handled, and their dispositions. The CCA staff now has access to the CPD's ETS system, and the City also compiles a spreadsheet of all complaints and their CCA and CPD status, to track their handling in the two agencies.

The Regional Computer Center and the CCA are currently in the process of finalizing the Citizen Complaint Case Management System. While this system has taken some time to be put in place, its implementation will significantly assist the CCA in managing and tracking its caseload. The Citizen Complaint Case Management System will include the following fields: CCA Case Number, CPD Case Number, CPD Date Received, CPD Date Closed, Incident Date, Allegations, Complainant Name, Sex and Race, Officer Name, Sex and Race, CPD Disposition, CCA Disposition, CCA Board action, Date Submitted to City Manager, City Manager's Disposition, and CPD Action. This automated tracking system will replace the current process of coordinating case status information in the current Provue database and the manual processes associated with investigative case management. The Citizen Complaint Case Management System will further enhance the CCA's ability to integrate relevant case completion data. In addition, the Case Management System will ensure that any deficiencies in efficient coordination of CCA and CPD investigations are eliminated.

In the fourth quarter of 2005, the CCA and CPD participated jointly in the Management Training Program at the Cincinnati Police Academy. The program provided an opportunity to create awareness for CPD management staff. Training

objectives included helping supervisors and police officers do a better job receiving and handling citizen complaints; familiarizing supervisors and police officers with the process for handling complaints that are within the jurisdiction of the CCA; and educating CPD members about the role of the CCA.

Paragraph 86 requires the CCA to issue annual reports summarizing its activities for the previous year including a review of significant cases and recommendations. Such reports shall be issued to the City Council and the City Manager, and made available to the public. The CCA issued its 2004 Annual Report in June 2005. It expects to complete its 2005 Annual Report in the next quarter.

Status Update

Both documents are completed. The CCA has distributed copies of the patterns report to the Chief of Police and the Parties. Ken Glenn, Interim Director, will be meeting with the Chief and City Manager to discuss it. Currently, the CCA annual report is at the printers and should be back soon. Upon its arrival, it will be distributed.

APPENDIX

1. Memo: Code Enforcement Response Team
2. The Neighborhood Quality of Life Code PowerPoint
3. Intelligence Analysis Training Agenda
4. CPPC Memo: Roll Call Presentations
5. CPD Training Records (February, March, and April)
6. Agenda: CPOP Liaison Meeting – March
7. “Conversation on Building Neighborhoods”
8. The BUZZ on CPOP
9. “Stop the Violence Youth Conference”
10. CPD Collaboration: Lighthouse Youth Services
11. Internal Communications Council meeting minutes (February and April)
12. Quarterly Problem Solving Reports
13. Procedure: 12.370, Problem Solving Process
14. Form 562, CPD Community Problem Oriented Policing Resource Request
15. 2006 Leadership Retreat Agenda
16. Crime Analysts’ Data
17. *The Blue Wave* Newsletter – Winter
18. CPOP Training PowerPoint
19. Public Appearance Reports – CPD
20. *Enquirer* article, “Forum focuses on shootings”
21. CPPC’s CPOP Monthly Status Report March 2006
22. CPOP Spreadsheet: Details of Concern by Community Members